

# UNITED STAT DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

L	APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	W 1	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
	09/283,431	04/01/99	ZHOU	W	475.08.423
Γ	WAYNE A KEOWN HALE & DORR 60 STATE STREET BOSTON MA 02109		HM22/1013	<b>EXAMINER</b> HICKEY, K	
			1 11 Thursday C. A. C. A. S.		
				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				1635	
				DATE MAILED:	<u>)</u> 10/13/99

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks** 

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/283431 Zhovet al
San Sun Sun India	Examiner Group And Let
-The MAILING DATE of this	Karen H Hickory 1635
THE INCLINE DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION APP	pears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address—
· orlow for nepty	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET OF THIS COMMUNICATION.	TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFF from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a lift NO period for reply is specified above.	R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS  reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.  ult, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication attute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status	and the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on	
☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on☐  This action is FINAL.	
	ot for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in 35 C.D. 1 1; 453 O.G. 213.
Disposition of Claims	
& Claim(s)	is/are pending in the application.
⊠ Claim(s) (-3	is/are allowed.
=	
☐ Claim(s)	is/are objected to.
pplication Papers	is/are objected to.  are subject to restriction or election requirement.
See the attached Notice of Draftonomon's Data and	
	g Heview, PTO-948.
➤ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing  ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on	
- The proposed drawing correction, filed on	
☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are object ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.	
☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are object ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.	
☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are object ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner. ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.	
☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are object ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner. ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. ☐ In oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. ☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the received.	is approved disapproved.  sed to by the Examiner.  der 35 U.S.C. § 11 9(a)-(d).  he priority documents have been
☐ The drawing(s) filed on	is approved disapproved.  ded to by the Examiner.  der 35 U.S.C. § 11 9(a)-(d).  the priority documents have been
☐ The drawing(s) filed on	is approved disapproved.  ded to by the Examiner.  der 35 U.S.C. § 11 9(a)-(d).  the priority documents have been  t)  national Bureau (PCT Bule 1.7.2(a))
☐ The drawing(s) filed on	is approved disapproved.  ded to by the Examiner.  der 35 U.S.C. § 11 9(a)-(d).  the priority documents have been  t)  national Bureau (PCT Bule 1.7.2(a))
☐ The drawing(s) filed on	is approved disapproved.  sed to by the Examiner.  der 35 U.S.C. § 11 9(a)-(d).  the priority documents have been  r)  national Bureau (PCT Rule 1 7.2(a)).
☐ The drawing(s) filed on	is approved disapproved.  sed to by the Examiner.  der 35 U.S.C. § 11 9(a)-(d).  the priority documents have been  r)  national Bureau (PCT Rule 1 7.2(a)).
☐ The drawing(s) filed on	is approved disapproved.  ded to by the Examiner.  der 35 U.S.C. § 11 9(a)-(d).  the priority documents have been  f)  national Bureau (PCT Rule 1 7.2(a)).
☐ The drawing(s) filed on	is approved disapproved.  sed to by the Examiner.  der 35 U.S.C. § 11 9(a)-(d).  ne priority documents have been  r)  national Bureau (PCT Rule 1 7.2(a)).

Page 2

Application/Control Number: 09/283,431

Art Unit: 1635

### **DETAILED ACTION**

This application contains sequence disclosures that are encompassed by the definitions for nucleotide and/or amino acid sequences set forth in 37 CFR 1.821(a)(1) and (a)(2). However, this application fails to comply with the requirements of 37 CFR 1.821 through 1.825 because there are amino acid and nucleotide sequences disclosed in the drawings and the text of the specification which have not been submitted in computer readable format as required by the rules set forth in 37 CFR 1.821 through 1.825. Additionally, sequences should be assigned sequence ID numbers and should be identified using those numbers in the format SEQ ID NO: # when referred to in the specification, figure legends and claims.

A complete reply to this Office action must include compliance with this request.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Application/Control Number: 09/283,431 Page 3

Art Unit: 1635

Claims 1-3 are drawn to an "improved" antisense oligonucleotide which contains one or more blocks of alternating phosphodiester and phosphorothioate bonds.

Claims 1-3 recite an improvement on an antisense molecule, without defining the scope of what antisense that includes, in terms of what was known in the art. In the case of a claim which admits to an improvement, such as a Jepson claim, an independent claim is required to include "a preamble comprising a general description of all the elements or steps of the claimed combination which are conventional or known" (see MPEP 1.75 (e)). Claims 1-3 recite an improvement, but do not provide a general description of the elements of the known antisense oligonucleotides which are being improved upon. Although the improvement is defined, the antisense oligonucleotide is not, therefore one skilled in the art would not know what antisense oligonucleotides are encompassed by these claims.

#### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Arnold et al.

Claims 1 and 2 are drawn to an antisense oligonucleotide containing "POPS Blocks", wherein pops blocks are defined to be regions of alternating nucleoside phosphodiesters and

Art Unit: 1635

nucleoside phosphorothioates (see p6, lines 14-31). The pattern of phosphorothioate and phosphodiester bonds can be variable, but the ratio remains between 1:3 and 3:1. Additionally, the claims are drawn to oligonucleotides which contain "POPS Blocks" and are hybrid oligonucleotides, wherein hybrid is defined as an oligonucleotide containing deoxynucleotides flanked by ribonucleotides, 2'-substituted ribonucleotides (including 2'-OMethyl), or a combination thereof.

Arnold et al. teach antisense oligonucleotides which have a core of alternating phosphodiester and phosphorothioate bonds, flanked by regions of 2' O-methyl substituted bases (see p 85-88). Therefore, Arnold et al. anticipates claims 1 and 2.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arnold et al. in view of Agrawal et al.

Claim 3 is drawn to an antisense oligonucleotide containing regions of alternating nucleoside phosphodiesters and nucleoside phosphorothioates and are inverted hybrid

Application/Control Number: 09/283,431

Art Unit: 1635

Page 5

oligonucleotides, wherein inverted hybrid is defined as an oligonucleotide with a core consisting of ribonucleotide or 2' substituted ribonucleotide bases flanked by deoxyribonucleotide bases.

Arnold et al. teach oligonucleotides with an alternating phosphodiester and phosphorothioate backbone to provide nuclease resistance (see p 9, lines 20-24 and p 11, line 29 and p 85-88) in chimeric and hybrid oligonucleotides. Arnold et al. do not teach making antisense oligonucleotides with an alternating phosphodiester and phosphorothioate backbone in an inverted chimeric hybrid.

Agrawal et al. teach making inverted hybrid oligonucleotides with chimeric backbones, throughout their disclosure and claims, because inverted hybrid oligonucleotides have fewer side effects relative to traditional phosphorothioate, hybrid or chimeric oligonucleotides (see abstract).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to make an inverted hybrid antisense oligonucleotide with an alternating phosphorothioate and phosphodiester backbone to derive both the benefit of nuclease stability from the alternating backbone and reduced side effects from the inverted hybrid. From Arnold et al., one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that incorporation of an alternating phosphodiester and phosphorothioate backbone into any antisense oligonucleotide would have imparted greater stability against nucleases. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would have expectated that incorporating an alternating phosphodiester and phosphorothioate backbone into the prior art inverted hybrid oligonucleotide taught by Agrawal would have imparted the benefit of nuclease stability, as taught by Arnold et al.

Art Unit: 1635

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Karen A. Hickey at telephone number (703)308-7523.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, George Elliot can be reached at (703) 308-4003. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 308-4242.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

Karen A. Hickey October 7, 1999

> HIN L. LEGUYADER RIMARY EXAMINER GROUP 1800